

ISSN 1343-8980

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年 報

平成26年度
(第18号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2014

Volume XVIII

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2015・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2015

Comparing Buddhist and Jaina Attitudes towards Warfare: Some Notes on Stories of King Ajātaśatru's/Kūṇika's War against the Vṛjis and Related Material*

WU Juan

Abstract:

This paper compares Buddhist and Jaina attitudes towards warfare as reflected in textual sources related, directly or indirectly, to King Ajātaśatru's/Kūṇika's war against the Vṛjis (or the Licchavis and their allies). It argues that while the Buddhists and Jainas, who composed or redacted those sources, shared the same unwillingness to apply the principle of *ahiṃsā* to political utilization of military forces at the national level, they nonetheless held different opinions on the reconcilability of military obligations with ethical-religious values at the individual level. In particular, a comparative reading of a set of three parallel *suttas* in the *Samyutta-nikāya* (IV 308–311) and Section 7.9 of the *Viyāhapannatti* shows that although both the Buddha and Mahāvīra refute the Brahmanical idea of heavenly rebirths of battle-slain soldiers, the Buddha stresses the incompatibility of the warrior ethic with Buddhist values, while Mahāvīra addresses the possibility of combining military obligations with Jaina values.

Buddhism and Jainism, as cousin traditions, emerged roughly at the same time (ca. 5th century BCE) from the same geographical milieu of northeastern India (ancient Magadha, present-day Bihar) where they confronted the same political-social realities including, *inter alia*, military violence. Meanwhile, both religions promote, in didactic terms, the ethical ideal of *ahiṃsā* (nonviolence), and both call for abstention from killing living beings. Given these commonalities, one may wonder: did Buddhists and Jainas in ancient India take the same approach to handling the tension between the reality of warfare and the ideal of *ahiṃsā*? If not, how did their approaches differ?

Questions of this kind, so far as I am aware, have not been seriously considered in previous studies. Nevertheless, they are arguably important for our understanding of the ideological priorities and preoccupations of ancient Buddhists and Jainas. As one step towards such an understanding—and thus also as a further step towards understanding their shared world of discourse—the present paper compares Buddhist and Jaina attitudes towards

* Most of the present research was carried out during my postdoctoral fellowship at the University of Tokyo and with financial support from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 65th Annual Conference of the Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies held at Musashino University, August 30–31, 2014. The paper was revised in January 2015, during my fellowship at the International Institute for Asian Studies, Leiden, and with financial support from the Jan Gonda Foundation. I wish to express my gratitude to Jonathan Silk, Seishi Karashima, Masahiro Shimoda, and Naomi Appleton for their valuable advice for improving the paper. Any errors that remain are mine alone.

warfare through investigating narrative sources related to King Ajātaśatru's war against the Vṛjīs found in both religious traditions.

It has long been observed that both ancient Buddhists and Jainas told stories about a war between the Magadhan king Ajātaśatru (named Kūṇika in Jainism) and the confederacy of the Vṛjīs, of which the most important constituent is the Licchavi tribe of Vaiśālī.¹ In examining the Buddhist and Jaina accounts, previous scholars have mainly focused on the overall differences between the Buddhist and Jaina storylines, and on the similarities between certain narrative details (such as the causes of the war, and the intrigues used in the conquest of Vaiśālī).² To date, no specific study has been done to compare Buddhist and Jaina attitudes towards warfare as reflected in the stories of King Ajātaśatru's/Kūṇika's war against the Vṛjīs and related material.³ This paper is an attempt to make such a comparison. In what follows, I will first look at the Buddhist attitude towards warfare in sources related, either directly or indirectly, to Ajātaśatru's war against the Vṛjīs. After this, I will look at the Jaina attitude towards warfare in sources related to Kūṇika's war against a tribal confederacy formed by the Licchavis and their allies. Then, in the rest of the paper, taking into account both the Buddhist and Jaina sources, I will remark on the similarities and differences between the Buddhist and Jaina attitudes towards war as discerned from those sources.

Buddhist Attitude towards Warfare in the Story of Ajātaśatru's War against the Vṛjīs and Related Material

As is well known, the various versions of the non-Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* (MPS) begin with an episode telling that King Ajātaśatru sends his minister Varṣākāra to seek advice

¹ See earlier observations by Raychaudhuri (1996 [1923], 185–190); Jacobi (1970 [1930], 807–813); Basham (1951, 68–78; 1953, 37–41); Nagraj (1974, 59–71). The confederacy of the Vṛjīs, as known from Buddhist sources, consisted mainly of the Licchavis, whose capital was at Vaiśālī, and the Videhas, whose capital was at Mithilā (see DBPN, 727, s.v. Vajjī; DPPN, ii. 813–815, s.v. Vajjī). The Jainas informed us that nine Mallai chiefs, nine Lecchai (= Licchavi) chiefs, and eighteen tribal kings of Kāśī and Kosala formed a confederacy in the fight against Kūṇiya (see Vy §7.9, *sutta* 299 [text in Doshi 1974–1982, i.304.1–2; summarized in Deleu 1970, 140; translated in Lalwani 1973–1985, iii.67], and Nir §1.19 [text in Deleu 1969, 110–111 = 1996, 50; translated in Wiles 2000, 139]). Abhayadeva (11th cent.) interpreted the confederacy as being formed by nine Mallai chiefs of Kāśī and nine Lecchai chiefs of Kosala (cf. Deleu 1970, 141), but this interpretation seems to be incorrect (cf. PrPN, ii.553, s.v. Mallai, n.2; cited in Wiles 2000, 139 n.111). On the correspondence between the Buddhist form Licchavi and the Jaina form Lecchai (Skt. *Lecchaki), see Jacobi 1884, 266 n.1.

² According to the Buddhists, Ajātasattu waged the war in order to obtain some fragrant material (*gandhabhaṇḍa*) near the Ganges (see Sv 516,21–517,12; Mp IV 15,11–16,4), and after sending his minister Vassakāra to sow dissension among the Vajjīs, Ajātasattu eventually conquered Vesālī (see Sv 522,19–524,4; Mp IV 17,4–5). According to the Jainas, Kūṇika waged the war in order to obtain an elephant in the climax of must (*gandhahatthī*) and a priceless necklace (see Nir §1.15–18 [text in Deleu 1969, 107–110 = 1996, 47–50; translated in Wiles 2000, 107–139]), and after sending the ascetic Kūlavālaka to deceive the people of Vaiśālī, Kūṇika finally captured the city (see ĀvC I 567.6–568.1, parallel to ĀvH 437a7–b8 and ĀvM 533a11–534b7; edited and translated in Koch 1990, 332–335). Basham (1951, 72–74) points out that the *gandhabhaṇḍa* in the Buddhist story corresponds to the *gandhahatthī* in the Jaina story, and that the deceiving role played by Vassakāra corresponds to that played by Kūlavālaka.

³ So far as I know, only Jaini (2007, 160–167) and Appleton (2014, 66–67) have considered together Buddhist and Jaina attitudes towards war. Since in their studies both scholars explore the issue of war for other purposes than providing a comparative survey of Buddhist and Jaina sources related to Ajātaśatru's/Kūṇika's campaign against the Vṛjīs (or the Licchavis and their allies), their explorations are therefore different from what I will undertake below.

from the Buddha regarding the waging of war on the Vṛjis. Having heard Varṣākāra's report of Ajātaśatru's plan to destroy the Vṛjis, the Buddha says that the Vṛjis will be invincible as long as they stick to seven principles of non-decline. Taking note of the Buddha's words, Varṣākāra realizes that the Vṛjis cannot be easily conquered. In the Pāli version, Vassakāra concludes that Ajātasattu will not be able to defeat the Vajjis simply by war, without using intrigue or sowing internal dissension.⁴

In commenting on this episode, Lambert Schmithausen rightly points out that although the Buddha's response to Varṣākāra appears like an attempt to discourage Ajātaśatru from attacking the Vṛjis, within the context of the MPS the real purpose of this episode is not to show the Buddha's discouraging stance on war, but to provide "a stepping stone" for introducing the following sermon, where the Buddha teaches the monks seven principles that can prevent their community from declining.⁵ Further, as a number of scholars have already noted,⁶ in this episode, while the Buddha speaks of the (temporary) invincibility of the Vṛjis, he expresses no outright condemnation of Ajātaśatru's plan to wage war, nor does he remark on the immorality of war from a Buddhist ethical point of view. The absence of explicit condemnation of political warfare is not unique to the MPS, but typical of most of early Buddhist canonical scriptures.⁷ The absence may well have been due to practical concerns of the Buddhist authors, for as both André Bareau and Lambert Schmithausen have suggested, those authors were almost certainly aware of the inevitability of warfare in the real world of ancient Indian politics, and the fact that any explicit condemnation of the utilization of military forces could have been interpreted by contemporary kings as an encroachment upon their political interests.⁸

While the Buddha is shown as making no condemnation of Ajātaśatru's plan to wage war in the MPS, elsewhere we find that he does make a clear rejection of the *kṣatradharma*, the duty of members of the warrior caste to fight in war.⁹ For instance, in a set of three parallel *suttas* found in the *Samyutta-nikāya*, three military headmen ask the Buddha almost the same

⁴ See DN II 76,2–4 (parallel to AN IV 20,29–21,1). This detail is only found in Pāli, not in the Sanskrit, Chinese or Tibetan versions of the episode (see Waldschmidt 1950–1951, ii.118–119, Vorgang 1.40; Bareau 1970, 23–24; Schmithausen 2014, 45 n.47). Note that the *Arthaśāstra* (XI.1.1–30), a classic Indian work on statecraft, recommends various "ways of [fermenting] dissension" (*bhedopādānāni*) as strategies for conquering confederacies (cf. Kangle 1960, 244.1–245.9 [text]; 1963, 526–529 [translation]; Olivelle 2013, 389–390 [translation]).

⁵ Schmithausen 2014, 45. For similar arguments, see Bareau 1993, 36; Collins 1998, 445.

⁶ Bareau 1993, 38; Schmithausen 1999, 49–51; Zimmermann 2000, 206–207; Shimoda 2002, 396–97.

⁷ Schmithausen (2014, 42) notes, "in the sermons of the early canon a straightforward *condemnation* of war and capital punishment is not easily found." (italics in original)

⁸ Bareau 1993, 38; Schmithausen 1999, 51; 2014, 44.

⁹ The most detailed studies to date of the notion of *kṣatradharma* are Hara (1968a; 1968b; 1969), which provide thorough examinations of all related evidence found in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Harivaṃśa*. Hara (1968a, 2; 1968b, 1) clarifies that *kṣatradharma* as seen in the epic literature falls into two categories: when used in peaceful contexts, *kṣatradharma* is synonymous to *rājadharmā*, referring to the duties of kings to protect their subjects, to rule in accordance with justice, and to honor brahmins; when used in the contexts of war, *kṣatradharma* refers specifically to the duty of warriors to fight bravely and to die heroic deaths on the battlefield.

questions (with only minor variations).¹⁰ In the first of the three *suttas*, the *Yodhājīvasutta*,¹¹ a soldier headman asks the Buddha:

sutam me bhante pubbakānam ācariyapācariyānaṃ yodhājīvānaṃ bhāsamānānaṃ yo so yodhājīvo saṅgāme ussahati vāyamati || tam enaṃ ussahantaṃ vāyamantaṃ pare hananti pariyāpādentī || so kāyassa bhedaṃ paramaṃ maraṇā Sarañjītānaṃ¹² devānaṃ saṃvayataṃ

¹⁰. See SN IV 308–311 (nos. 42.3–5); translated in Woodward 1927, 216–218; Bodhi 2000, ii.1334–36; Hattori et al. 2013, 673–679. Of the three *suttas*, only the *Yodhājīvasutta* (no. 42.3) has full parallels in two Chinese versions of the SĀ (T. 99, 227b10–227c11 [*sūtra* 908]; T. 100, 420b10–420c9 [*sūtra* 123]; no Sanskrit parallel has survived [see Enomoto 1994, 10; Chung 2008, 191]). The *Haṭṭhārohasutta* (no. 42.4) has no Chinese counterpart at all. The *Assārohasutta* (no. 42.5), strictly speaking, also finds no parallel in Chinese. Although both *sūtra* 909 of T. 99 and *sūtra* 124 of T.100 mention a horse-training leader corresponding to *assāroho gāmaṇi* in the *Assārohasutta*, the contents of the two Chinese *sūtras* are in fact totally different from the Pāli *sutta*. For comments on the three Pāli *suttas* as a whole, see Schmithausen 1999, 48; 2014, 45–46; Shimoda 2002, 397–98 [both scholars consider *sūtra* 909 of T. 99 and/or *sūtra* 124 of T. 100 to be parallel to the Pāli *suttas*, with which I could not agree]. On the *Yodhājīvasutta* alone, see Upadhyaya 1971, 531; Jaini 2007: 160–161; Appleton 2014, 67.

¹¹. As Bodhi (2000, ii.1449 n.339) and Jaini (2007, 160 n.15) point out, according to Buddhaghosa, the word *yodhājīva* literally means “one making a living through warfare” (Spk III 103, 20–21: *yuddhena jīvikam kappanako*), thus referring to a professional soldier.

¹². The Sinhalese, Burmese and Thai editions give different readings of this name. The sentence in question occurs four times in the *Yodhājīvasutta* and four times in the *Assārohasutta*. The table below provides an overview of different readings of this name in its eight occurrences (I thank Chris Clark of University of Sydney for helping me with identifying the readings in the Buddhajayantī [BJ] edition and King Chulalongkorn [KC] edition; the abbreviations S¹, S², S³, B¹ and B² separately refer to three Sinhalese and two Burmese manuscripts used by Léon Feer in producing the PTS edition of the SN):

Table 1 References and Readings of the Gods’ Name in Sinhalese, Burmese and Thai Editions of the *Yodhājīvasutta* and the *Assārohasutta*

No.	PTS Reference	PTS Reading	BJ Reference (Sinhalese)	BJ Reading (Sinhalese)	KC Reference (Thai)	KC Reading (Thai)	Chattha Saṅgāyana Reference (Burmese)	Chattha Saṅgāyana Reading (Burmese)	Chinese Counterpart in T. 99	Chinese Counterpart in T. 100
1	SN IV 308,24	Sarañjītānaṃ (S ¹ and S ²) Sarajitānaṃ (S ³)	SN IV (BJ vol. 16) 562,8	Sarañjītānaṃ	377,18	Sarajitānaṃ	SN IV (DPG vol. 26) 296, 25	Parajitānaṃ (= B ¹ , B ²)	箭降伏 “defeated by arrows” [*Sarañjītānaṃ] (227b15)	箭莊嚴 “decorated by arrows” [*Sarañjītānaṃ] (420b16)
2	SN IV 308,33	Sarañjītānaṃ (S ¹ , S ² , S ³)	SN IV 562,15	Sarañjītānaṃ	378,6	Sarajitānaṃ	SN IV 297, 4	Parajitānaṃ (= B ¹ , B ²)	—	—
3	SN IV 309,13	Sarajitānaṃ (S ¹ , S ² , S ³)	SN IV 562,26	Sarañjītānaṃ	378,17	Sarajitānaṃ	SN IV 297,13	Parajitānaṃ (= B ¹ , B ²)	箭降伏 (227b28)	—
4	SN IV 309,27	Sarañjītānaṃ (S ¹ , S ² , S ³)	SN IV 564,8	Sarañjītānaṃ	379,7	Sarajitānaṃ	SN IV 297,20	Parajitānaṃ (= B ¹ ; B ² : Parā°)	箭降伏 (227c6–8)	箭莊嚴 (420c6)
5	SN IV 310,13	Sarajitānaṃ (S ¹ , S ² , S ³)	SN IV 564,24	Sarañjītānaṃ	379,17	Sarajitānaṃ	SN IV 298,9	Parajitānaṃ (= B ¹ , B ²)	—	—
6	SN IV 310,22	— [omission indicated by <i>pe</i>] (S ¹ , S ² , S ³)	SN IV 564,32	Sarañjītānaṃ	380,4	Sarajitānaṃ	SN IV 298,14	Parajitānaṃ (= B ¹ , B ²)	—	—
7	SN IV 311,9	Sarajitānaṃ (S ¹ , S ² , S ³)	SN IV 566,10	Sarañjītānaṃ	380,14	Sarajitānaṃ	SN IV 298,22	Parajitānaṃ (= B ¹ , B ²)	—	—
8	SN IV 311,22	Sarajitānaṃ (S ¹ , S ² , S ³)	SN IV 566,20	Sarañjītānaṃ	381,4	Sarajitānaṃ	SN IV 299,5	Parajitānaṃ (= B ¹ , B ²)	—	—

There are basically three types of readings of this name: 1) *Sarañjītānaṃ* (lit. “anointed with arrows”, which may mean “decorated with arrows” in the present context), attested in the Buddhajayantī edition and in the three Sinhalese manuscripts used by Feer. In its two occurrences (Nos. 1 and 4), this reading, along with the following *devānaṃ saṃvayataṃ upapajjati*, matches the phrase 生箭莊嚴天 (“reborn in the Heaven Decorated

upapajjati || || *idha bhagavā kim āhā ti* || || (SN IV 308,20–25 [almost identical to 310,9–14]; see the Chinese counterparts at T. 99, 227b12–16, and T. 100, 420b13–16)

“O Venerable Sir, I have heard previous soldiers who were teachers and teachers of teachers saying, ‘When a soldier strives and exerts himself in battle, [if] others kill him, finish him off, while he is striving and exerting himself, at the breaking up of his body, after his death, he is reborn into the company of Sarañjita-gods.’ What does the Blessed One say in this case?”

The view that one who fights to death in battle is reborn in heaven seems to be very old and was arguably influential in the Brahmanical world. It has been suggested that the *Rgveda* 10.154.3 (cf. also *Atharvaveda* 18.2.17) may represent an early piece of evidence for this view.¹³ The verse states, “Those who fight in battles, who as heroes abandon their bodies, or those who offer a thousand gifts [to brahmin officiants]—also straight to them let him [= a dead man] go.”¹⁴ P. V. Kane points out that this verse implies that “warriors losing life in battle reap the same rewards that those who make gifts of a thousand cows in sacrifices secure.”¹⁵ Moreover, in the *Bhagavadgītā* (2.37), in persuading Arjuna to fight, Kṛṣṇa says to him, “Either you are killed and will attain to heaven, or you triumph and will enjoy the earth.

with Arrows”) in one Chinese version of the SĀ (T. 100, 420b16 and c6). Bodhi (2000, ii.1335) translates *Sarañjitanam* as “battle-slain”, which appears problematic to me. Woodward (1927, 216) and Malalasekera (DPPN, ii.1068, s.v. Sarañjita) seem to understand *Sarañjita* as *sa-rañjita* (instead of a compound formed by *sara* [< Skt. *śara* “arrow”] and *añjita* “anointed”) and translate it as “of Passionate Delight”. Perhaps based on the same understanding, Hattori et al. (2013, 673) translate *Sarañjitanam devānam* as “樂しみをともなう天 (倶樂天)” [“gods accompanied by delight”]. It is hard to say what *Sarañjita* really means, especially given that this word is a proper name and may have a non-Indic (for instance, Dravidian) origin. (2) *Sarājītanam* (“defeated by arrows”), attested in the Thai edition and in three Sinhalese manuscripts used by Feer. In its three occurrences (Nos. 1, 3 and 4), this reading, together with the following *devānam saḥavyatam upapajjati*, matches 生箭降伏天 (“reborn in the Heaven Conquered by Arrows”) in another Chinese version of the SĀ (T. 99, 227b15, b28, and c6–8). Akanuma cites the rendition 箭降伏天 as a correspondent to *Sarañjita* (DBPN, 593, s.v.). However, the Indic original of 箭降伏 must have been **Sarājīṭā* (or its derivative), and the correspondent to *Sarañjita* should be the aforementioned 箭莊嚴 (“decorated with arrows”). (3) *Parajītanam* (“defeated by others”), attested in the Burmese Sixth Council edition and in two Burmese manuscripts used by Feer. According to Norman (1969, i.134 [ad Th 49]), the *s/p* confusion seems to be very old, “which presumably dates from the time when the texts were first written down” in India, and “[t]he mistake arose from the similarity between the two letters in the Brahmī script, and can be seen in the Aśokan inscriptions”. For examples of such confusion in others Pāli texts, see Norman 1969, 134 [ad Th 49]; 1971, 56 [ad Th 6]; 2001, 234 [ad Sn 353] and 246 [ad Sn 418]. Since the Sinhalese tradition is, in general, more likely to preserve old readings (see von Hinüber 1971, 245) and in the present case the Sinhalese reading *Sarājītanam* finds evidence in Chinese, it can be suggested that *Sarājītanam* is older, whereas the Burmese reading *Parajītanam* is a later error.

¹³ See Kane 1993 [1946], 58; Schmithausen 1992, 138 n.194; Feller Jatavallabhula 1999, 96.

¹⁴ RV 10.154.3a–d (Nooten and Holland 1994, 563): *yé yūdhyante pradhāneṣu* ¹ *śūrāso yé tanātyājah* | *yé vā saḥśradakṣiṇās* ¹ *tāmś cid evāpi gachātāt* || This verse forms part of a funeral hymn, the poet of which, according to the Anukramaṇī (“index”), is Yamī, sister of Yama (ruler of the dead). According to Jamison and Brereton (2014, iii.1638), in this hymn, “[e]ach verse describes the character and habits of the distinguished forefathers now resident in the other world, and ends with a refrain urging the dead man to go and join them there”. There are different interpretations of *pradhāneṣu* in 3a. *yé yūdhyante pradhāneṣu*. Geldner (2003 [1951], 385) translates 3a, along with *śūrāso* in 3b, as “Die in den Kämpfen als Helden streiten”. Doniger (1981, 54) also translates, “Those who fight in battles as heroes”. Both understand *pradhāna* in the sense of “Kämpf/battle”, thus agreeing with the 14th-century commentator Śaṅkara’s explanation *pradhanāḥ saṃgrāmāḥ* (see Müller 1892, iv.474). Jamison and Brereton (2014, iii.1638), however, understand *pradhāna* as “prize-contest” instead of “battle, war”. They translate 3a as “Those who fight in prize-contests”, and 3b as “who as champions abandon their bodies”.

¹⁵ Kane 1993 [1946], 58.

Therefore rise up, Kaunteya [= Arjuna], resolved upon battle.”¹⁶ Also, in one section of the *Arthaśāstra* concerning how to rouse the courage of soldiers before a war, Kauṭilya recommends, “Bards and panegyrists should proclaim heaven for the brave and exclusion from heaven for the timid, and extol the castes, associations, families, deeds, and conduct of the soldiers.”¹⁷ In the *Mānava–Dharmaśāstra*, heavenly rebirths are promised to those kings who fight bravely in battles. As the text claims, “When kings fight each other in battles with all their strength, seeking to kill each other and refusing to turn back, they go to heaven.”¹⁸ Since works such as the *Bhagavadgītā*, the *Arthaśāstra*, and the *Mānava–Dharmaśāstra* drew considerably on earlier sources, it is likely that the view of heavenly rebirths of battle-slain warriors had already become popular even before the composition of those works.¹⁹ In the *Yodhājīvasutta* (as well as in the *Hatthārohasutta* and the *Assārohasutta*), however, such a popular view is utterly rejected by the Buddha who replies to the headman as follows:

yo so gāmaṇi yodhājīvo saṅgāme ussahati vāyamati || tassa taṃ cittam pubbe hīnaṃ duggaṭam²⁰ duppaṇihitaṃ ime sattā haññantu vā bajjhantu vā ucchiṇṇantu vā vinassantu vā mā ahesuṃ iti vā ti || taṃ enaṃ ussahantaṃ vāyamantaṃ pare hananti pariyāpādentī || so kāyassa bhedaṃ param maraṇā Sarājītā nāma niraya²¹ tatthupapajjati || (SN IV 309,4–9)

¹⁶ BhG 2.37 (Belvalkar 1947, 122): *hato vā prāpsyasi svargaṃ jīvā vā bhokṣyase mahīm | tasmād uttiṣṭha Kaunteya yuddhāya kṛtaniścayaḥ ||* Translation quoted from van Buitenen 1981, 77. On this verse, see also Jaini 1979, 314 n.62; 2000: 14–15; 2004, 57–58; 2007: 162–63. For a detailed discussion on the idea of heavenly rebirths of battle-slain soldiers as illustrated in the Sanskrit epic literature, see Hara 1968b, 5–30. As Hopkins (1889, 94, 185 and 200) notes, the *Mahābhārata* holds that not just warriors, but also slaves (*śūdras*) attain heaven by fighting and dying in battles.

¹⁷ AŚ 10.3.43 (Kangle 1960, 237.10–11): *sūtamāgadadhāḥ śūrāṇāṃ svargaṃ asvargaṃ bhīrūṇāṃ jātī-saṃghakulakarmavṛttastavaṃ ca yodhānāṃ varṇayeyuḥ |* Translation quoted from Olivelle 2013, 379. See also an earlier translation in Kangle 1963, 510.

¹⁸ MDh 7.89 (Olivelle 2005, 628.3–4): *āhaveṣu mitho 'nyonyaṃ jighāṃsanto mahīkṣitaḥ | yudhyamānāḥ paraṃ śaktyā svargaṃ yānti aparāṇmukhāḥ ||* Translation quoted from Olivelle 2005, 159.

¹⁹ On the composition dates of the MDh (ca. 2nd–3rd centuries CE) and the AŚ (ca. 175–300 CE), see respectively Olivelle 2005, 25, and 2013, 31. As for the BhG, Brockington (1998, 147–48) suggests the 1st century CE as its probable composition date on the basis of its linguistic and stylistic features.

²⁰ The Burmese Sixth Council edition (DPG 26, 217.8) has *gahitaṃ dukkaṭaṃ* (“seized, misarranged”) for *hīnaṃ duggaṭam*. *Dukkaṭaṃ* is also the reading preserved in Buddhaghosa’s commentary (cf. Spk III 103,24 = DPG 31, 141.12: *dukkāṭaṃ ti duṭṭhu kataṃ*, “‘misarranged’ means that it was badly arranged”).

²¹ As in the case of *Sarājītānaṃ/Sarajitānaṃ/Parajitānaṃ* (see above, note 12), the Sinhalese, Thai and Burmese editions also give different readings of the hell’s name. The sentence in question occurs once in the *Yodhājīvasutta* and once in the *Assārohasutta*. The table below provides an overview of different readings of this name in its two occurrences:

Table 2 References and Readings of the Hell’s Name in Sinhalese, Burmese and Thai Editions of the *Yodhājīvasutta* and the *Assārohasutta*

No.	PTS Reference	PTS Reading	BJ Reference (Sinhalese)	BJ Reading (Sinhalese)	KC Reference (Thai)	KC Reading (Thai)	Chatṭha Saṅgāyana Reference (Burmese)	Chatṭha Saṅgāyana Reading (Burmese)	Chinese Counterpart in T. 99	Chinese Counterpart in T. 100
1	SV IV 309,9	Sarājītā (S ¹ , S ² , S ³)	SN IV (BJ vol.16) 562,23	Sarājīto	378,13	Sarajito	SN IV (DPG vol.26) 297,10	Parajito (= B ¹ , B ²)	—	—
2	SV IV 311,5	Sarājīto (S ¹ , S ² , S ³)	SN IV 566,7	Sarājīto	380,11	Sarajito	298,19	Parajito (= B ¹ , B ²)	—	—

There are two types of readings of this name: (1) *Sarājītā* or *Sarājīto* (“defeated by arrows”), attested in the Thai edition and in three Sinhalese manuscripts used by Feer. Woodward (1927, 217) translates *Sarājītā nirayā* as “Purgatory of Quarrels” and Bodhi (2000, ii.1335) translates it as “Battle-Slain Hell”, both of which seem

[almost identical to 310,27–311,5]; see the Chinese counterparts at T. 99, 227b18–25, and T. 100, 420b20–27)

“O Headman, when a soldier strives and exerts himself in battle, he must have had this low, depraved and misdirected thought beforehand: ‘Let those beings be killed, be captivated, be destroyed, be exterminated.’ Or, ‘Let them not exist.’ [If] others kill him, finish him off, while he is striving and exerting himself, at the breaking up of his body, after his death—there is a hell named *Sarājītā* (‘Defeated by Arrows’)—there he is reborn.”

The Buddha goes on to clarify that the view that one fighting to death in battle is reborn in heaven is a “perverted view” (*micchādiṭṭhi*), and that anyone who holds such a view will be reborn either in hell or in the animal realm.²² The Buddha’s answer to the headman’s question addresses the absolute incompatibility of the warrior ethic with the Buddhist ideology that promotes the cultivation of a mind free from any defilements. This incompatibility is also suggested by some other textual sources. For instance, as Rupert Gethin has amply shown, in both the Theravāda *Abhidhamma* and Sarvastivāda *Abhidharma* literature, it is consistently maintained that the intentional killing of a living being is, in all circumstances, motivated by hatred or aversion (Pāli *dosa*; Skt. *dveṣa*) and therefore can only be regarded as an unwholesome (Pāli *akusala*; Skt. *akuśala*) act leading to unpleasant karmic result.²³

Thus, as far as we can discern from the Buddhist canonical sources, although the Buddhist authors, being aware of the inevitability of warfare in their days, made no attempt to morally criticize Ajātaśatru’s war against the Vrijis (or any other military affairs),²⁴ it is

problematic. (2) *Parajīto* (“defeated by others”), attested in the Burmese Sixth Council edition and in the two Burmese manuscripts used by Feer. According to Buddhaghosa’s commentary (Spk III 103,24–104,2; DPG 31: 141.12–14), *Sarājītā nāma nirayā* [DPG: *parajīto nāma nirayo*] *ti ayam pi na viṣuṃ eko nirayo. avīciyaṃ yeva* [DPG: *avīcisseva*] *pana ekasmim koṭṭhāse pañcāvudha-sannaddhā phalaka-hatthā hatthi-assa-rathe āruyha saṅgāme yujjhantā viya paccanti. taṃ sandhāy’ etaṃ vuttaṃ* (“As for ‘a hell named Defeated-by-Arrows’ [DPG: ‘a hell named Defeated-by-Others’], this is not an individual hell on its own. Rather, within one division in the Avīci hell [DPG: of the Avīci hell], those armed with five weapons, with shields in their hands, having climbed onto elephants, horses and chariots, fighting in a battle, as it were, are boiled. With reference to this implication, this [= the hell’s name] is said.”) Compared with *Parajīto nāma nirayo*, the reading *Sarājītā nāma nirayā* (or its variant *Sarājīto nāma nirayo*) seems to fit better with Buddhaghosa’s explanation, since he does not mention the defeat of those hell-beings by others, but he does mention that they were armed with weapons. Neither of the two Chinese versions of the SĀ mentions the name of the hell in which killed soldiers are reborn.

²² SN IV 309,10–17 [almost identical to 311,6–13]; translated in Woodward 1927, 217; Bodhi 2000, ii.1335; Hattori et al. 2013, 674. See the Chinese counterparts at T. 99, 227b25–c1, and T. 100, 420b27–28. According to Jaini (2007: 162), this definition of *micchādiṭṭhi* may be applied to the same word that appears in the story of King Duṭṭhagāmaṇi in the *Mahāvamsa* (XXV 110). See also below note 60.

²³ Gethin 2004, 174–189; 2007, 70–71.

²⁴ To be sure, there is indeed some early textual evidence showing Buddhist disapproval of warfare. For instance, a *sutta* (no. 3.2.4) in the *Kosala-samyutta* (SN I 82,24–83,32) and its Chinese parallels (T. 99, 338b29–c20 [*sūtra* 1236]; T. 100, 395c7–19 [*sūtra* 63]) describe a battle between Ajātaśatru and Prasenajit of Kosala. In commenting on Ajātaśatru’s defeat of Prasenajit, the Buddha utters a verse to address the disadvantage of war for both the victor and the loser (SN I 83,31–32; DPG 23: 101.11–12: *jayam veram pasavati dukkhaṃ seti parajīto | upasanto sukhaṃ seti hitvā jayam parājayan* [DPG: *jayaparājayan*] *ti* || “The Victorious one breeds enmity. The defeated one sleeps unhappily. The one at peace, having given up victory and defeat, sleeps happily”). See the Chinese counterparts at T. 99, 338c18–19 and T. 100, 395c17–18; parallel verses in Dhp 201, Avś I 57.10–11, and Uv XXX.1. See also earlier studies by Upadhyaya 1971, 535; Enomoto 1994, 51; Choong 2006, 25; Chung 2008, 218. The Buddha, however, does not mention the immoral nature of war as such. In fact, as Schmithausen (2014, 43) observes, “the sermons [in early Buddhist canonical literature] are, on the whole, remarkably reserved with respect to the moral evaluation of warfare” (parentheses added by the present author).

nonetheless clear that war in any form, whether aggressive or defensive, runs directly counter to and is therefore simply incompatible with the Buddhist values. In the Jaina story of King Kūṇika's war against the Licchavis and their allies, Mahāvīra also makes comments on the warrior ethic, and his opinion is somewhat different from the Buddha's. It is to the Jaina sources that we now turn.

Jaina Attitude towards Warfare in the Story of Kūṇika's War against the Licchavis and Their Allies

The fifth *Aṅga* of the Śvetāmbara canon, known as the *Viyāhapannatti* (Skt. *Vyākhyā-prajñapti*, "Proclamation of Explanations") or *Bhagavatī-sutta* (Skt. *Bhagavatī-sūtra*, "Holy Scripture"), whose nucleus may be dated between the 1st century BCE/1st century CE and the 3rd century CE,²⁵ is perhaps the oldest extant Jaina source on Kūṇika's military activities. In this text there is a conversation between Mahāvīra and his disciple Gautama regarding two battles that are said to have taken place between Kūṇika and his enemies (including the Mallas, the Licchavis, and their allies), namely, the "Battle of Great Stones" (Pkt. *mahāsilākaṇṭaga saṃgāma*) and the "Battle of the Chariot with the Mace" (*rahamusala saṃgāma*).²⁶ According to the text, Kūṇika won both battles, and in each battle hundreds of thousands of soldiers were killed. Being devoid of good conduct and not observing any religious vow, those who died in the first battle were reborn as hell beings or animals.²⁷ As for those who died in the second battle, Mahāvīra says, "Among them, ten thousands were reborn in the womb of a fish. One was reborn in heaven. One was reborn in a good family. The rest were generally reborn in hell or in the animal realm."²⁸ Having heard this, Gautama

²⁵ On this dating, see Ohira (1994, 1 and 22). In commenting on Ohira's chronological scheme of the Śvetāmbara Jaina canonical texts, Dundas (2006, 386) says, "While this model might at times be judged overschematic and mechanical (...), it is the most convincing available thus far..."

²⁶ The story of the two battles in Viy 7.9 has been discussed by Ohira (1994, 170–171); Jaini (2000, 14–16; 2002, 145; 2004, 57–59; 2007, 163–167); Kawasaki (2004); Dundas (2006, 393; 2007, 47–48); Appleton (2014, 66–67). Only Jaini (2007) and Appleton (2014) have noted the connection of the Viy's account with the Buddhist *Yodhājīvasutta*.

²⁷ Viy 7.9, *sutta* 299 (Doshi 1974–1982, i.306.6–8): *te naṃ bhaṃte maṇuyā nissīlā jāva nippaccakkhāna-posahovavāsā sāruttā parikuviyā samaravahiyā aṇuvasaṃtā kalamāse kalamā kiccā kaḥiṃ gatā kaḥiṃ uvavannā? Goyamā osannaṃ naraga-tirikkhajoṇiesu uvavannā* | According to Doshi (306 n.1), 'jāva' *padena* 'nigguṇā nimmerā' *ity evaṃ viśeṣaṇadvayam atra yojyam*, "Given the word jāva [*<* Skt. *yāvat*, 'up to'], a pair of adjectives are to be added here, i.e., 'devoid of virtues, without restraints'." So the passage may be translated as follows: "[Gautama asked,] 'O Venerable Sir, being devoid of good conduct, [devoid of virtues, unrestrained,] not observing any vow or fast, enraged, wrathful, killed in the battle, with passions unpacified, at the time of death, having finished their lives, where did those men go, where were they reborn?' [Mahāvīra said,] 'O Gautama, they were generally reborn in hell or as animals.'" Lalwani (1973–1985, iii.70) translates *nippaccakkhāna-posahovavāsā* as "devoid of confession and fast". This is incorrect, for *nippaccakkhāna* ("one who does not take the vow of *paccakkhāna* ['renouncement of certain foods or activities]') corresponds to Skt. **niṣpratyaḥkhyāna* rather than **niṣpratīkramaṇa* ("one who does not practice *pratīkramaṇa* ['ritualized confession']"). Although both *pratyākhyāna* and *pratīkramaṇa* are recommended practices for the Jaina laity, their meanings are different (see Jaini 1979, 189–190). On the compound *nippaccakkhāna-posahovavāsā* (or its variant *ṇippa°*) referring to "one who does not observe any vow or fast even on sacred days", see Ratnachandra 1923–1932, ii.958, s.v. *ṇippaccakkhāna*. On this passage, see also Jaini (2007: 164).

²⁸ Viy 7.9, *sutta* 300 (Doshi 1974–1982, i.307.10–11): *tattha naṃ dasa sāhasā egāe macchīyāe kucchīṃsi uvavannā, ege devalogesū uvavanne, ege sukule paccāyāte avasesā osannaṃ naraga-tirikkhajoṇiesu uvavannā*.

asks Mahāvīra as follows:

*bahujaṇe ṇaṃ bhaṃte annamannassa evaṃ āikkhati jāva*²⁹ *parūveti evaṃ khalu bahave maṇussā annataresu uccāvaesu saṃgāmesu abhimuhā ceva pahayā samāṇā kalamāse kalamā kiccā annayaresu devaloesu devattāe uvavattāro bhavaṃti | se kaṃham etaṃ bhaṃte evaṃ |* (Viy 7.9, sutta 302)³⁰

“O Venerable Sir, many people talk thus to each other, [speak thus, declare thus,] expound thus, ‘Indeed, many men who are killed while facing forward [i.e., facing their enemies]’³¹ in various big and small battles, at the time of death, having finished their lives, are reborn as gods in various heavenly realms.’ Then, O Venerable Sir, is this so?”³²

This question is remarkably similar to the one the headman asks the Buddha in the *Yodhājīvasutta* discussed above. The similarity suggests that both the Buddhists and Jains paid specific attention to the dominant Brahmanical idea that soldiers who fight to death on the battlefield reap rewards in heaven.³³ While Mahāvīra, like the Buddha, also refutes such an idea, saying, “Those who spoke in this way spoke a falsehood,”³⁴ his explanation is different from that given by the Buddha. He clarifies that among those soldiers killed in the “Battle of the Chariot with the Mace” only one was reborn in heaven. That one was a Jaina layman called Varuṇa. According to Mahāvīra, “on one occasion, while practising the *ṣaṣṭabhakta* fast, Varuṇa, grandson of Nāga, was commanded by the order of the king, by the order of the assembly, by the order of the army [to join] in the Battle of the Chariot with the Mace.”³⁵ Before joining in the battle, he made a vow: “When I am fighting the Battle of the Chariot with the Mace, if someone strikes [me] first, it is then fitting to strike [him] back. Otherwise, it is not fitting [to strike].”³⁶ Having entered the battlefield, he encountered an

²⁹ Here *jāva* refers to a description of talk among people which is given in full in Uvav 38 (Leumann 1883, 49.11–12: *bahujaṇo aṇṇamannassa evaṃ āikkhai evaṃ bhāsai evaṃ paṇṇavei evaṃ parūvei*); see also Deleu 1969, 92 [*jāva* no. 20] = 1996, 32. I include the whole description in my translation.

³⁰ Doshi 1974–1982, i.307.20–308.2.

³¹ The word *abhimuḥa* (< *abhimukha*, “facing forward”) implies that the soldiers did not flee but died bravely. In discussing the warriors’ death in the *Mahābhārata*, Feller Jatavallabhula (1999, 97) notes, “an important precondition for their going to heaven is that they should die *abhimukha* (facing the enemy), that is, die a heroic death, and not that of a coward struck in the back while attempting to flee.”

³² Deleu (1970, 39) notes that in the Viy the discussions between Mahāvīra and Gautama regarding heretical views follow a pattern: Gautama states such-and-such a view and asks Mahāvīra’s opinion; Mahāvīra answers that such-and-such a view is false and then proclaims such-and-such other view in this concern.

³³ Dundas (2006, 393) suggests that the story of the two battles in the Viy actually refers to the marital world portrayed in the *Mahābhārata* “where a glorious death in battle was reckoned to lead to heaven”.

³⁴ Doshi 1974–1982, i.308.3: *je te evaṃ āhaṃsu micchaṃ te evaṃ āhaṃsu*. Jaini (2007, 165) points out, “The word *micchaṃ* used by Mahāvīra here to characterize the disputed assertion is reminiscent of the term *micchādiṭṭhi* employed by the Buddha in the *Yodhājīva-sutta*.”

³⁵ Doshi 1974–1982, i.308.9–10: *Varuṇe Nāganattue annayā kayāt rāyābhiogeṇaṃ gaṇābhiogeṇaṃ balābhiogeṇaṃ rahamusale saṃgāme āṇatte samāṇe chaṭṭhabhattie*. On *chaṭṭha-bhattia* (Skt. **ṣaṣṭa-bhaktika*) referring to one who refuses to take food until the 6th meal (i.e., one spending 2½ days by fasting), see Schubring 1935, 174, §156. On this sentence, see also a comment by Kawasaki (2004, 46) who notes that the phrase *rāyābhiogeṇaṃ gaṇābhiogeṇaṃ balābhiogeṇaṃ* (“by the order of the king, by the order of the assembly, by the order of the army”) also appears in the *Uvāsagadasāo* 58 (Hoernle 1885–1888, i.23.13–14 [text], ii.35 [translation]) and in the *Āvassaya* 6.1 (Puṇyavijaya and Bhojak 1977, 350.8–9). In both texts, the phrase is used to refer to a case where a Jaina layman is forced—rather than spontaneous—to pay homage or to make donations to a heretical community.

³⁶ Doshi 1974–1982, i.309.10–11: *kappati me rahamusalaṃ saṃgāmaṃ saṃgāmemaṇassa je puvviṃ*

enemy who challenged him to fight. Varuṇa said to that man, “O Beloved of the Gods, it is not fitting to strike you when I am not struck [by you]. Please strike [me] first!”³⁷ On hearing this, that man shot Varuṇa with an arrow. Varuṇa then reacted as follows:

*tae ṇaṃ se Varuṇe Nāgaṇattue teṇaṃ puriseṇaṃ gādhappahārīkae samāṇe āsurutte jāva*³⁸
misimisemāṇe dhaṇuṃ parāmusati dhaṇuṃ parāmusittā usuṃ parāmusati usuṃ
parāmusittā āyatakaṇṇāyataṃ usuṃ kareti āyatakaṇṇāyataṃ usuṃ karettā taṃ purisaṃ
egāhaccaṃ kūḍāhaccaṃ jīviyāto vavaroveti | (Viy 7.9, *sutta* 302)³⁹

Then Varuṇa, grandson of Nāga, severely injured by that man, immediately enraged, [furious, intemperate,] and gnashing his teeth with anger, took up his bow. Having taken up the bow, he fitted an arrow. Having fitted the arrow, he drew the arrow to his ear. Having drawn the arrow to his ear, he deprived that man at once⁴⁰ of his life.

Being mortally wounded, Varuṇa left the battlefield and retreated to a solitary place. He paid homage to Mahāvīra from afar, and then took both the five lay vows and the five mendicant vows as follows:

vaṃdittā namaṃsittā evaṃ vayāsī puvviṃ pi ṇaṃ mae samaṇassa bhagavato Mahāvīrassa
*aṃtiyaṃ thūlae pāṇātivāte paccakkhāe jāvajjivāe evaṃ jāva*⁴¹ *thūlae pariggahe*
paccakkhāe jāvajjivāe iyāṇiṃ pi ṇaṃ ahaṃ tass’ eva bhagavato Mahāvīrassa aṃtiyaṃ
*savvaṃ pāṇātivāyaṃ paccakkhāmi jāvajjivāe evaṃ jahā Khaṃdao jāva*⁴² *etaṃ pi ṇaṃ*
carimehiṃ ussāsaṇissāsehiṃ vosirissāmi tti kaṭṭu sannāhapaṭṭaṃ muyati sannāhapaṭṭaṃ
muittā salluddharaṇaṃ kareti salluddharaṇaṃ karettā āloiyapaḍikkamte samāhipatte
āṇupuvvīte kālagate (Viy 7.9, *sutta* 302)⁴³

Having venerated [Mahāvīra], having paid homage, he [= Varuṇa] said this, “I have formerly, in the presence of Lord Śramaṇa Mahāvīra, renounced gross killing [i.e., killing

pahaṇati se paḍihaṇittae avasese no kappatṭi. On the infinitive ending *-ittae*, see Pischel 1900, §578.

³⁷. Doshi 1974–1982, i.309.18–19: *no khalu me kappati devāṇuppiyā puvviṃ ahayassa pahaṇittae tumaṃ ceva puvvaṃ pahaṇāhi*.

³⁸. Here *jāva* refers to a phrase given in full in Viy 3.2, *sutta* 143 (cf. Doshi 1974–1982, i.146.15–16: *āsurutte ruṭṭhe kuvie caṃḍikkie misimisemāṇe*). See also Deleu 1969, 94 [*jāva* no. 60] = 1996, 35 (Deleu gives the *sutta* number as 144). I have included the entire phrase in my translation. On *√misimisa* (“to quash teeth with anger and to tremble”) of onomatopoeic origin, see Ratnachandra 1923–1932, iv.178, s.v.; Pischel 1900, 380–381, §558.

³⁹. Doshi 1974–1982, i.310.1–4.

⁴⁰. The overall meaning of the adverbial stock phrase *egāhaccaṃ kūḍāhaccaṃ* is “at once”. The word *egāhacca* (< *eka* + *āhatya/āhr̥tya*) literally means “to be killed in one blow”, and *kūḍāhacca* (< *kūṭa* + *āhatya/āhr̥tya*) means “to be killed by an iron hammer”. Perhaps *kūḍāhaccaṃ* explains *egāhaccaṃ*. On the usage of this stock phrase in Jaina texts, see Bollée (1969, 43–45; 2002, 239). These two words may be classified under the category of rhyme and homoioteleuton (cf. Gonda, 1959, 201ff.; I thank Professor W. Bollée for directing my attention to J. Gonda’s book [email 12 January 2015]).

⁴¹. Here *jāva* refers to a phrase given in full in Uvav 87 (cf. Leumann 1883, 72.34–36: *thūlae pāṇāivāe paccakkhāe jāvajjivāe, musāvāe adinṇ’-ādāṇe paccakkhāe jāvajjivāe, savve mehuṇe paccakkhāe jāvajjivāe, thūlae pariggahe paccakkhāe jāvajjivāe*). I have included the whole phrase in my translation. On this *jāva*, see also Bollée 2002, 173.

⁴². Here *jāva* refers to a long prayer spoken by the Jaina monk Khaṃdaa (Skt. Skandaka) before his death in Viy 2.1, *sutta* 94 (see Doshi 1974–1982, i.93.3–13; translated in Lalwani 1973–1985, i.176–177). On the story of Skandaka, see PrPN, i.211, s.v. 2. Khaṃdaa.

⁴³. Doshi 1974–1982, i.310.16–22.

of higher form of life]⁴⁴ as long as I live; [I have renounced lying and stealing as long as I live; I have renounced all illicit sexual activity as long as I live;] I have renounced vast possessions as long as I live.⁴⁵ Now, once again, in the presence of Lord Mahāvīra, I renounce all killing [of living beings] as long as I live—and so on, just as Skandaka said [in Viy 2.1]⁴⁶—up to: with my last breaths, I shall abandon it [= my body].” Having said this, he removed his armour. Having removed his armour, he took out the arrow [from his body]. Having taken out the arrow, he confessed his misdeeds and vowed to restrain from them. He attained concentration, and died in due course.”⁴⁷

Varuṇa was reborn in heaven.⁴⁸ Mahāvīra predicts that after finishing his life in heaven, Varuṇa will be reborn in the land of Mahāvideha and then attain liberation.⁴⁹ Mahāvīra also explains that because those gods living nearby, on knowing Varuṇa’s death, rained down flowers and played divine music, people consequently (mistakenly) concluded that all soldiers killed in battles are reborn in heaven. Another soldier in the same battle, who was an old friend of Varuṇa and likewise severely injured, after having witnessed Varuṇa’s actions, took the lay vows and also died a peaceful death.⁵⁰ Mahāvīra says that after death this man was reborn in a good family, and that in his final life he will also attain liberation in the land of Mahāvideha.⁵¹

In commenting on this story, Paul Dundas points out, “Significantly, the *Bhagavatī Sūtra* conveys no outright condemnation of the waging of war as such; rather it makes clear that going into battle when commanded by one’s leader is obligatory but also that to do so with

⁴⁴. This is a translation of the locative absolute *thūlae pāṇātivāte paccakkhāe* (Skt. **sthūlake prāṇātipāte pratyākhyāte*), which refers to the layman’s *ahiṃsā-vrata* (“vow of non-injury”), the first *aṇuvrata* (see note below). In Jainism, while it is obligatory for the ascetics to renounce the killing of any life-forms, the laity are mainly required to renounce *sthūla-hiṃsā* (“gross injury”), i.e., the killing of higher life-forms with two to five sense organs (see Schubring 1935, 187–188, §170; Williams 1967, 65–66).

⁴⁵. These are the five *aṇuvratas* (“minor vows”) to be undertaken by Jaina laymen, i.e., *ahiṃsā* (“non-injury”), *satya* (“truthfulness”), *asteya* (“not stealing”), *brahmacarya* (“sexual restraint”), and *aparigraha* (“non-possession”). For more details, see Schubring 1935, 187–189, §170; Jaini 1979, 170–178.

⁴⁶. The statement of Skandaka (see above, note 42) contains the five *mahāvratas* (“great vows”) that are taken during initiation into mendicancy (*dīkṣā*). By making these five vows, Varuṇa became a Jaina monk. The five *mahāvratas* also include *ahiṃsā*, *satya*, *asteya*, *brahmacarya* and *aparigraha*, but are more restrictive in nature than the five *aṇuvratas* of laymen. See Schubring 1935, 189–191, §171; Jaini 1979, 15 n.32 and 243 n.3.

⁴⁷. See also translations by Lalwani (1973–1985, i.76) and Jaini (2004, 58–59; 2007, 166).

⁴⁸. Doshi 1974–1982, i.311.18: *Goyamā sohamme kappe aruṇābhe vimāṇe devattāe uvavanne* | “Gautama! He [= Varuṇa] was reborn in the state of a god in the celestial abode named Aruṇābha in Saudharmakalpa [i.e., the first celestial region whose lord is Sakra].”

⁴⁹. Doshi 1974–1982, i.311.21–23: *se ṇaṃ bhaṃte Varuṇe deve tāo devalogāto āukkhaeṇaṃ bhavakkhaeṇaṃ thitikkhaeṇaṃ jāva Mahāvīdehe vāse sijjihiti jāva aṃtaṃ kāhiti* | “[Gautama asked,] ‘Then, O Venerable Sir, the god Varuṇa, having died from there, from the heavenly realm, due to the exhaustion of his lifespan, the exhaustion of his existence, the exhaustion of his duration, (...) up to¹: [Mahāvīra replied, ‘O Gautama,] in the country of Mahāvīdeha he will attain enlightenment, (...) up to²: he will put an end [to all suffering].’” The first *jāva* (“up to¹”) refers to a formulaic question on the future rebirth of a god, which is given in full in Uvav 101 (see Leumann 1883, 75.21–23: *...deve tāo devalogāto āu-kkhaeṇaṃ bhavakkhaeṇaṃ thitikkhaeṇaṃ aṇantaraṃ cayaṃ caittā kahim gacchihiti, kahim uvavajjihiti*; see also Deleu 1969, 93 [jāva no. 40] = 1996, 33). The second *jāva* (“up to²”) refers to a formula about one’s rebirth in Mahāvīdeha and final liberation, which is given in full in Uvav 102–116 (see Leumann 1883, 75.24–80.3; Deleu 1969, 93 [jāva no. 41] = 1996, 33). I cannot include this formula in my translation, due to its considerable length.

⁵⁰. Doshi 1974–1982, i.310.23–311.7; paraphrased in Deleu 1970, 142; Jaini 2000, 15; 2004, 59; 2007, 166–167; translated in Lalwani 1973–1985, iii.77; Kawasaki 2004, 48.

⁵¹. Dosh 1974–1982, i.312.2–5; translated in Lalwani 1973–1985, iii.78–79.

the wrong, impassioned attitude, specifically not informed by Jaina values, leads to an ignominious rebirth.”⁵² In contrast to many other soldiers devoid of Jaina faith and fighting fervently to death on the battlefield, Varuṇa fought in conformity with Jaina values and prepared himself for a pious death. His rebirth in heaven may be seen as a result of a combination of three causes including, first, his identity as a devoted Jaina layman, second, his resolve not to be the first to strike but to fight only in self-defense, and third, his undertaking of both the lay vows and the mendicant vows before his death. The portrayal of Varuṇa in this story thus represents a Jaina approach to resolving the dilemma faced by some lay practitioners who have to fulfill their military obligations on the one hand, and to maintain the principle of *ahiṃsā* on the other. Indeed, as Padmanabh S. Jaini puts it, the story of Varuṇa shows that the Jainas, from the early times, “appear to have outlined a path of nonviolence that would allow a lay adherent to conduct his daily life with human dignity while permitting him to cope with the unavoidable reality of the world in which violence is all-pervasive”.⁵³

In the Jaina narrative tradition of Kūṇika’s war with the Licchavis and their allies, there is also another person dead in the war and then reborn in heaven. He is the Jaina layman Ceṭaka, King of Vaiśālī. Although not mentioned in the *Viyāhapannatti*, he is featured in the *Nirayāvaliyāo* (Skt. *Nirayāvalikā*, “Sequence of Hells”), the eighth *Upāṅga* of the Śvetāmbara canon, which may have attained its current form sometime between 350 and 500 CE.⁵⁴ According to the *Nirayāvaliyāo*, Kūṇika together with his ten half-brothers wages a war (i.e., the afore-mentioned “Battle of the Chariot of the Mace”) against Ceṭaka who is then forced to fight in defense of the city of Vaiśālī. During the war, Ceṭaka kills with his arrows Kūṇika’s ten half-brothers who are all reborn in hell due to their unwholesome deeds in the battle.⁵⁵ The *Nirayāvaliyāo* does not tell us Ceṭaka’s death or his next birth. In the *Āvassaya-cuṇṇi* (Skt. *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi*) attributed to Jinadāsa (ca. 7th century CE) and the *Āvaśyaka-ṭīkā* written by Haribhadra (ca. 8th century),⁵⁶ we are told that when Kūṇika besieges Vaiśālī, being hugely humiliated, Ceṭaka jumps into water and is reborn in heaven after death.⁵⁷ In his *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita* (“Lives of Sixty-three Illustrious Persons”), Hemacandra (1089–1172 CE) gives a more detailed account of the death of Ceṭaka, according to which Ceṭaka

⁵². Dundas 2006, 393 = 2007, 48.

⁵³. Jaini 2004, 60.

⁵⁴. On this dating of the *Nirayāvaliyāo*, see Ohira 1994, 2–3; Wiles 2000, xiv.

⁵⁵. The death and rebirths of Kūṇika’s half-brother Kāla is related in detail in Nir 1.20–21. The same fates of his ten other half-brothers are abbreviated in Nir 2 and 3–10 (see Deleu 1969, 111 [text] and 113 [summary] = 1996, 51 [text] and 53 [summary]; Wiles 2000, 143–147 [translation]).

⁵⁶. The *Āvassaya-cuṇṇi* is a Prākṛit prose commentary on the *Āvassaya-nijjuttī* (Skt. *Āvaśyaka-niryukti*) which itself is a Prākṛit versified commentary on the *Āvassaya-sutta* (Skt. *Āvaśyaka-sūtra*, “Discourse on Obligatory Duties”), one of the four *mūlasūtras* (“basic scriptures”) of the Śvetāmbara Jaina canon. Haribhadra’s *Āvaśyaka-ṭīkā*, written in mixed Prākṛit and Sanskrit, is also a prose commentary on the *Āvassaya-nijjuttī*.

⁵⁷. ĀvC II 174.10–12: *Koṇiko bhaṇai Ceṭaka kiṃ karomi. bhaṇati jāva pukkharīṇṭto uṭṭhemi tāva nagarīm mā atṭhi tti. teṇa paḍivaṇṇaṃ. Ceṭao savvaloham iḡaṃ paḍimaṃ gale baṃdhium otiṇṇo. dharaṇeṇaṃ sabhavaṇaṃ ṇṭto. kālagato devatte gato* | “Kūṇika said, ‘Ceṭaka, what should I do [with the city of Vaiśālī]?’ He replied, ‘Do not enter the city, until I rise from the lotus pond [after drowning myself in it].’ He [= Kūṇika] agreed. Having tied a statue made entirely of copper to his own neck, Ceṭaka entered [the lotus pond]. Dharaṇa [i.e., king of Nāgākumāra-gods] brought him to his [Ceṭaka’s?] own house. He [= Ceṭaka] died and attained the state of a god.” See a parallel passage at ĀvH 685b3–5.

practices fasting before jumping into water, and at the moment of death, he concentrates on taking four refuges (i.e., taking refuge in Arhats, Siddhas, Sādhus and the Dharma), and on confessing his own guilt.⁵⁸ Although I have not been able to find the source(s) on which Hemacandra's account was based, there can be no doubt that in the eyes of Hemacandra and perhaps also his forerunners such as Jinadāsa and Haribhadra, it is very reasonable for a Jaina warrior such as Ceṭaka, who fights in self-defense and dies a pious death (even without taking the ascetic vows as Varuṇa did), to attain rebirth in heaven. Thus, as in the case of Varuṇa, the story of Ceṭaka also represents a Jaina attempt to reconcile one's military obligations with the principle of nonviolence that lies at the core of Jainism.

Comparative Remarks

Through comparing the Buddhist and Jaina sources examined above, we may identify the similarities and differences between Buddhist and Jaina attitudes towards warfare at national and individual levels respectively:

First, as far as the national utilization of military forces is concerned, neither the Buddhist nor Jaina texts convey any explicit condemnation of the immorality of King Ajātaśatru's/ Kūṇika's waging of war. In the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, although stressing the temporary invincibility of the Vṛjīs, the Buddha makes no moral judgment of Ajātaśatru's plan to start a war on them. In the *Viyāhapannatti* and the *Nirayāvaliyāo*, Mahāvīra does not criticize the practice of warfare either, but simply narrates it in a matter-of-fact manner. The absence of condemnation suggests that both the Buddhists and Jainas, who composed or transmitted those texts, were unwilling, or at least hesitant, to apply the ethical-religious principle of nonviolence to political affairs such as a king's obligation to expand his kingdom. Their unwillingness, in turn, suggests that both religious groups were clearly aware of the inevitability of warfare in the real political world in which they were living, and the impracticability of totally abandoning military forces for any kingdom intending to survive in such a violent world.

Second, as far as individual soldiers' participation in warfare is concerned, while both the Buddha and Mahāvīra are shown as refuting the influential Brahmanical idea that soldiers killed in battles are reborn in heaven, their arguments on this issue are different. As we have seen, in a set of three almost identical *suttas* in the Pāli *Samyutta-nikāya* (IV 308–311) as well as their Chinese parallels, the Buddha explains that soldiers who die in battles are reborn in hell, due to their depraved mental status at the moment of death. The Buddha gives this explanation in reference to all types of killing in war, and does not make any exception for the case of self-defense. Such an explanation addresses the incompatibility of the warrior

⁵⁸. Śāha (1977, 378.5–379.2, verses 391–402): *atha mṛtyuśriyam iva baddhvā 'yaḥ putrikāṃ gale | Ceṭako 'naśanam kṛtvā 'vikṣad astāghavārīṇi || 391 ||...|| evam ārādhnam kṛtvā namaskāraparāyaṇaḥ | vipadya Ceṭakaḥ svargasukhabhājanatām yayau || 402 ||* Johnson (1962, 330–331) translates, "Then tying an iron doll to his neck, like a sign of death, Ceṭaka fasted and jumped into deep water...After making final propitiation thus, engaged in reciting the namaskāra, Ceṭaka died and became a participant in the joys of heaven." On the four refuges (*catuḥ-saraṇa*), see Jaini 1979, 164. Unlike in the story of Varuṇa, there is no mention of Ceṭaka's change into a Jaina monk through undertaking the five *mahāvratas* before his death.

ethic with Buddhist values. In the *Viyāhapannatti*, while Mahāvīra also points out that many soldiers fighting to death in the “Battle of the Chariot with the Mace” underwent unpleasant rebirths due to their impassioned mental status and lack of religious piety, he further clarifies that there was indeed one soldier, the Jaina layman Varuṇa, reborn in heaven. Varuṇa’s heavenly rebirth as a result of his dedication to Jaina religious practices (such as fast and taking both the five *aṇuvratas* of a layman and the five *mahāvratas* of an ascetic), his resolve to fight only in self-defense, and his pious mind at the moment of death, clearly shows that for the Jaina authors (or redactors) of the *Viyāhapannatti* it is absolutely possible to combine military obligations with Jaina values. The same may also be said of another Jaina warrior, King Ceṭaka of Vaiśālī, whose rebirth in heaven after fighting against Kūṇika likewise speaks of the compatibility of military actions with Jaina values.⁵⁹

In sum, a comparative survey of the Buddhist and Jaina sources related, directly or indirectly, to King Ajātaśatru’s/Kūṇika’s war against the Vṛjis (or the Licchavis and their allies) suggests that while the Buddhists and Jainas, who composed or redacted those sources, shared the same unwillingness to apply the principle of nonviolence to warfare at the national level, they nonetheless held different opinions on the reconcilability of military obligations with ethical-religious values at the individual level. Given that the Buddhist sources (such as the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* and the *Samyutta-nikāya*) examined above are from the early canonical literature and the Jaina sources (such as the *Viyāhapannatti* and the *Nirayāvaliyāo*) are from the Śvetāmbara canon, the observations made in this paper are thus mainly applicable to the Buddhist and Śvetāmbara Jaina attitudes towards warfare at the early stages of the two religious traditions. As previous scholars have already shown, both within Buddhism and within Jainism, there have been dynamic and diverse attitudes towards military violence.⁶⁰ Since the sources I have utilized comprise just a small fraction of

⁵⁹. Dundas (1991, 174) notes, “In fact, Jainism has always been ambivalent about war.” He gives two examples—first, a Jaina general (*senāpati*) contemporary with Mahāvīra, and second, Jaina soldiers in the armies of the Moghul emperors in the 16th century CE—which “testify to the existence of Jain practitioners of warfare at completely different period of Jain history”. Jaini (2002, 145) also notes that while ancient Jainas made long lists of occupations that may involve violence and were therefore considered to be unsuitable for a Jaina layman (for such lists, see Williams 1967, 117–123), military service was not included in these lists, but regarded as a permissible occupation for Jaina laypeople.

⁶⁰. On the dynamics of Indian Buddhist attitudes towards war, see Schmithausen 1999; Zimmermann 2004; Gethin 2007. On the dynamics of Jaina attitudes towards war, see Dundas 2007; Jaini 1979, 311–313; 2004. As Jaini (2007) shows, another Buddhist text that may be related to the story of the “Battle of the Chariot with the Mace” in the *Viyāhapannatti* is the Ceylonese chronicle *Mahāvamsa* (Mhv) written perhaps a little before 500 CE. There, in comforting King Duṭṭhagāmaṇi who feels guilty about the massacre he has committed during his war against the Damiḷa King Eḷāra, eight *arahants* speak the following verses to Duṭṭhagāmaṇi (Mhv XXV 109–110): *saggamaggantarāyo ca n’atthi te tena kammunā | diyaḍḍhamanuḍḍa v’ettha ghātita manujādhīpa || saraṇesu thito eko pañcasīle pi cāparo | micchādīṭṭhi ca dussīla sesā pasusamā matā ||* Geiger (1912, 178) translates, “From this deed arises no hindrance in thy way to heaven. Only one and a half human beings have been slain here by thee, O lord of Men. The one had come unto the (three) refugees; the other had taken on himself the five precepts. Unbelievers and men of evil life were the rest, not more to be esteemed than beasts.” Jaini (2007, 165) notes that there is “a happy coincidence” between the two Buddhist soldiers mentioned in these verses and the two Jaina soldiers (Varuṇa and his friend) in the *Viyāhapannatti*. The Mhv does not tell us the ensuing rebirths of the two good soldiers. Even so, there can be doubt that for the author of the Mhv, military activities and Buddhist values can go hand in hand with each other. Such compatibility is more clearly shown in the destiny of King Duṭṭhagāmaṇi himself who, as told later in the Mhv (XXXII 77ff.), attained rebirth in the Tusita heaven (see also Dīp XIX 23) due to his patronage of Buddhism (or more specifically, the

Buddhist and Jaina literature, the present survey therefore offers only a glimpse of a much larger picture. A systematic comparison of Buddhist and Jaina sources on war still needs to be done, in order to gain a fuller understanding of similarities and differences between the two Indian religions in their approaches to nonviolent ideal and violent reality.

Abbreviations

Unless otherwise stated, references to Pāli texts follow the standard system set out in V. Trenckner et al., *A Critical Pāli Dictionary* (Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy; Bristol: The Pali Text Society, 1924–2011).

- AŚ R. P. Kangle (ed.). 1960. *The Kauṣīlīya Arthaśāstra*. Part I. A Critical Edition with a Glossary. Bombay: University of Bombay.
- ĀvC *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi* of Jinadāsa = Ānandasāgarasūri (ed.). 1928–1929. *Śrīmad-Jinadāsa-gaṇimahattara-kṛtayā cūrṇyā sametaṃ śrīmad-Āvaśyakasūtram*. 2 vols. Ratlam: Śrīṣabhadevajī Keśarīmālājī Śvetāmbara saṃsthā.
- ĀvH *Āvaśyaka-ṭkā* of Haribhadra = Āgamodaya Samiti (ed.). 1916–1917. *Śrīmad-bhavaviraha-Haribhadrasūri-sūtrita-vṛtty-alaṃkṛtaṃ śrīmad-Āvaśyakasūtram*. 2 vols. Bombay.
- ĀvM *Āvaśyaka-ṭkā* of Malayagiri = Āgamodaya Samiti (ed.). 1928–1936. *Śrīman-Malayagiryācārya-kṛtavivaraṇa-yutaṃ śrī-Āvaśyakasūtram*. 3 vols. Bombay.
- Avś J. S. Speyer (ed.). 1902–1909. *Avadānaçataka: A Century of Edifying Tales, Belonging to the Hīnayāna*. 2 vols. St. Pétersbourg: Commissionnaires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences.
- BhG *Bhagavadgītā* (Belvalkar 1947, 74–203)
- BJ 1960–1989. *Buddhajayantī Tripiṭakagranthamālā*. Colombo: Śrī Lankā Prajātāntrika Samājavādī Janarajaya.
- DBPN Akanuma Chizen 赤沼智善. 1931. *Indo bukkyō koyū meishi jiten* 印度佛教固有名詞辞典 [Dictionary of Indian Buddhist Proper Names]. Reprint: Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館, 1967.
- Dhp O. v. Hinüber and K. R. Norman (eds.). 1994. *Dhammapada, with a complete Word Index compiled by Shoko Tabata and Tetsuya Tabata*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Dīp Hermann Oldenberg (ed. and tr.). 1879. *The Dīpavaṃsa: An Ancient Buddhist Historical Record*. Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate.
- DPG 1993–1998. *Dhammagiri-Pāli-Ganthamālā*. Publication of the Burmese Sixth Council edition of the Pāli canon in Devanāgarī script. Igatpuri: Vipassana Research Institute.
- DPPN Malalasekera, Gunapala Piyasena. 1937–1938. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*. 2 vols. Reprint: London: The Pali Text Society, 1974.
- KC King Chulalongkorn edition of the *Samyuttanikāya* = Ahimsakatthera Medhādhammarasa (ed.). 1893 (Rattanakosin sok 112). *Phraḥ Suttantapiṭaka Samyuttanikāya Saḷāyatanavagga*. Bangkok.
- MDh Patrick Olivelle (ed. and tr.). 2005. *Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmaśāstra*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mhv Wilhelm Geiger (ed.). 1908. *The Mahāvamsa*. Reprint: London: The Pali Text Society, 1958.
- MPS *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*
- Nir Jozef Deleu (ed.). 1969. “Nirayāvaliyāsuyakkhandha: Uvanga's 8–12 van de jaina Canon.” *Orientalia Gandensia* 4: 77–150. Translated into English by J. W. de Jong and Royce Wiles. *Philologica Asiatica*. Monograph Series 10. Tokyo: The Chūō Academic Research Institute, 1996.
- Pkt. Prākṛit
- PrPN Mohanlal Mehta and K. Rishabh Chandra. 1970–1972. *Prakrit Proper Names*. 2 vols. Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology.
- PTS Pāli Text Society
- RV Barend A. van Nooten and Gary B. Holland (eds.). 1994. *Rig Veda: A Metrically Restored Text with an Introduction and Notes*. Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 50. Cambridge, MA: Dept. of Sanskrit and Indian

Mahāvihāra sect), despite his appalling crime of massacre. In contrast, on the Jaina side, in the *Ādipurāṇa* written by the 8th-century Digambara poet Jināsena we see an almost total withdrawal from military violence in the story of Bāhubali's single combat (instead of a full-scale battle) with his half-brother Bharata for kingship, Bāhubali's subsequent abandonment of kingship to Bharata, and his eventual enlightenment as a Jaina monk. Dundas (2007, 49) comments that the story of Bāhubali “demonstrates, at least at an ideal level, how Jain writers felt the requirements of warfare could be balanced by non-violence.” For a detailed analysis of this story, see Dundas (1991, 180–181).

- Studies, Harvard University.
- SĀ *Samyuktāgama*
- Skt. Sanskrit
- T. *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經
- Uv Franz Bernhard (ed.). 1965. *Udānavarga*. Band I: Einleitung, Beschreibung der Handschriften, Textausgabe, Bibliographie. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden X. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Uvav *Uvavāiyasutta* = Ernst Leumann (ed.). 1883. *Das Aupapātika Sūtra, erstes Upāṅga der Jaina*. I. Einleitung, Text und Glossar. Reprint: Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint Ltd, 1966.
- Viy Becharadas J. Doshi (ed.). 1974–1982. *Viyāhapannattisuttaṃ*. Jaina-Āgama-Series No. 4. 3 Parts. Bombay: Shri Mahāvira Jaina Vidyālaya.

References

- Appleton, Naomi. 2014. *Narrating Karma and Rebirth: Buddhist and Jain Multi-life Stories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bareau, André. 1970. *Recherches sur la biographie du Buddha dans les Sūtrapitaka et les Vinayapitaka anciens. II. Les derniers mois, le parinirvāṇa et les funérailles*. Tome I. Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Basham, A. L. 1951. *History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas. A Vanished Indian Religion*. London: Luzac. Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1981.
- . 1953. “Ajātasattu’s War with the Licchavis.” In *Indian History Congress, Proceedings of the Fourteenth Session, Jaipur 1951*, edited by P. C. Gupta, 37–41. Calcutta: Indian History Congress.
- Belvalkar, S. K. 1947. *The Bhīṣmaparvan: Being the Sixth Book of the Mahābhārata, the Great Epic of India*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Bodhi (Bhikkhu). 2000. *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A New Translation of the Samyutta Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Bollée, Willem. 1969. “āhacca.” *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 83 (1): 26–48.
- . 2002. *The Story of Paesi (Paesi-kahāṇayam). Soul and Body in Ancient India. A Dialogue on Materialism*. Text, Translation, Notes and Glossary. Beiträge zur Kenntnis südasiatischer Sprachen und Literaturen 8. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Brockington, John. 1998. *The Sanskrit Epics*. Leiden: Brill.
- van Buitenen, J. A. B. 1981. *The Bhagavadgītā in the Mahābhārata*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Choong, Mun-keat. 2006. “A Comparison of the Pāli and Chinese Versions of the *Kosala Samyutta*, an Early Buddhist Discourse on King Pasenadi of Kosala.” *Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies* 7: 21–35.
- Chung, Jin-il. 2008. *A Survey of the Sanskrit Fragments Corresponding to the Chinese Samyuktāgama* 雜阿含經相當梵文斷片一覽. Tokyo: Sankibo.
- Collins, Steven. 1998. *Nirvana and Other Buddhist Felicities: Utopias of the Pali Imaginaire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deleu, Jozef. 1970. *Viyāhapannatti (Bhagavaṇ): The Fifth Anga of the Jaina Canon. Introduction, Critical Analysis, Commentary & Indexes*. Brugge. Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1996.
- Doniger (O’Flaherty), Wendy. 1981. *The Rig Veda. An Anthology*. London: Penguin Group.
- Dundas, Paul. 1991. “The Digambara Jain Warrior.” In *The Assembly of Listeners: Jains in Society*, edited by Michael Carrithers and Caroline Humphrey, 169–186. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2006. “A Non-Imperial Religion? Jainism in Its ‘Dark Age’.” In *Between the Empires: Society in India 300 BCE to 400 CE*, edited by Patrick Olivelle, 383–414. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2007. “The Non-Violence of Violence: Jain Perspective on Warfare, Asceticism and Worship.” In *Religion and Violence in South Asia: Theory and Practice*, edited by John R. Hinnells and Richard King, 41–62. London: Routledge.
- Enomoto Fumio 榎本文雄. 1994. *A Comprehensive Study of the Chinese Samyuktāgama: Indic Texts Corresponding to the Chinese Samyuktāgama as Found in the Sarvāstivāda-Mūlasarvāstivāda Literature. Part I: *Saṃgītanipāta*. Kyoto: Kacho Junior College.
- Feller Jatavallabhula, Danielle. 1999. “Rāṇayajña: The Mahābhārata War as a Sacrifice.” In *Violence Denied: Violence, Non-Violence and the Rationalization of Violence in South Asian Cultural History*, edited by Jan E. M. Houben and Karel R. van Kooij, 69–103. Leiden: Brill.
- Geiger, Wilhelm. 1912. *The Mahāvamsa, or the Great Chronicle of Ceylon*. Translated into English, assisted by Mabel Haynes Bode. London: Published for the Pali Text Society by Oxford University Press.
- Geldner, Karl Friedrich. 1951. *Der Rig-Veda, aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen*. 4 vols. Harvard Oriental Series, vols. 33–36. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Reprint: Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 63, 2003.

- Gethin, Rupert. 2004. "Can Killing a Living Being Ever Be an Act of Compassion? The Analysis of the Act of Killing in the Abhidhamma and Pali Commentaries." *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 11: 167–202.
- . 2007. "Buddhist monks, Buddhist kings, Buddhist violence: On the early Buddhist attitudes to violence." In *Religion and Violence in South Asia: Theory and Practice*, edited by John R. Hinnells and Richard King, 62–82. London: Routledge.
- Gonda, Jan. 1959. *Stylistic Repetition in the Veda*. Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.
- Hara Minoru 原実. 1968a. "Kṣatra-dharma jō: Kodai indo no bushidō" Kṣatra-dharma (上)——古代インドの武士道 [Kṣatra-dharma (I): The Warrior's Way in Ancient India]. *Tōyō gakuho* 東洋学報 51 (2): 1–34 (304–271 sic).
- . 1968b. "Kṣatra-dharma ge: Kodai indo no bushidō" Kṣatra-dharma (下)——古代インドの武士道 [Kṣatra-dharma (II): The Warrior's Way in Ancient India]. *Tōyō gakuho* 東洋学報 51 (3): 1–37 (456–420).
- . 1969. "Kṣatra-dharma (Addenda)——古代インドの武士道." *Tōyō gakuho* 東洋学報 51 (4): 1–10 (606–597).
- Hattori Ikurō 服部育郎, Nitta Tomomichi 新田智通, Iriyama Junko 入山淳子, and Yamaguchi Tsutomu 山口 務. 2013. *Genshi Butten II. Sōōbukyōten* 4. 原始仏典 II 相应部經典第四卷. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- von Hinüber, Oskar. 1971. "Die 'dreifache' Wirkung des Karma." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 13 (4): 241–249.
- Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf. 1885–1888. *The Uvāsagadasāo, or the Religious Profession of an Uvāsaga Expounded in Ten Lectures, Being the Seventh Anga of the Jains*. 2 vols. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.
- Hopkins, Edward. 1889. "The Social and Military Position of the Ruling Caste in Ancient India, as Represented by the Sanskrit Epic." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 13: 57–376.
- Jacobi, Hermann. 1884. *Gaina Sūtras*. Translated from Prākṛit. Part I. The *Ākārāṅga Sūtra*. The *Kalpa Sūtra*. The Sacred Books of the East. Vol. XXII. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- . 1930. "Buddhas und Mahāvīras Nirvāṇa und die politische Entwicklung Magadhas zu jener Zeit." Reprint in *Hermann Jacobi. Kleine Schriften*, edited by Bernhard Kölver, vol. 2, 803–814. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Jaini, Padmanabh S. 1979. *The Jaina Path of Purification*. California: University of California. Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1998.
- . 2000. "Ahimsā: A Jaina Way of Spiritual Discipline." In *Collected Papers on Jaina Studies*, edited by the same author, 3–19. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- . 2002. "Ecology, Economics, and Development in Jainism." In *Jainism and Ecology: Nonviolence in the Web of Life*, edited by Christopher Key Chapple, 141–156. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- . 2004. "Ahimsā and 'Just War' in Jainism." In *Ahimsā, Anekānta and Jainism*, edited by Tara Sethia, 47–61. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- . 2007. "A Note on *micchādīṭṭhi* in Mahāvamsa 25.110." *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 29: 153–168.
- Jamison, Stephanie W., and Joel P. Brereton. 2014. *The Rigveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, Helen M. 1962. *The Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra or the Lives of Sixty-Three Illustrious Persons by Ācārya Śrī Hemacandra*. Volume VI. Baroda: Oriental Institute.
- Kane, P. V. 1993. *History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Mediaeval Religious and Civil Law)*. Vol. III. Third Edition. First Published in 1946. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Kangle, R. P. 1963. *The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra*. Part II. An English Translation with Critical and Explanatory Notes. Bombay: University of Bombay.
- Kawasaki Yutaka 河崎豊. 2004. "Shusse suru Jaina kyō zaike shinja" 出征するジャイナ教在家信者 [A Jaina Layperson Going to War]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 53 (1): 45–49 (436–432).
- Koch, Rolf-Heinrich. 1990. *Die Namaskāra-vyākhyā der Āvaśyaka-Tradition*. Ph.D. diss., Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität zu München.
- Lalwani, K. C. 1973–1985. *Bhagavatī Sūtra: Prakrit Text with English Translation and Notes Based on the Commentary of Abhayadeva Sūri*. 4 vols (Śatakas 1–11). Calcutta: Jain Bhawan.
- Müller, F. Max. 1892. *Rig-Veda-Samhitā: The Sacred Hymns of the Brāhmans together with the Commentary of Sāyanākārya*. Second Edition. Volume IV. Mandala X. London: Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press.
- Nagraj (Muni). 1974. *King Bimbisāra and King Ajātaśatru in the Age of Mahāvīra & Buddha*. Ladnun: Āgama & Sāhitya Prakāshan, Jaina Vishva Bharati.
- Norman, K. R. 1969. *The Elders' Verses I: Theragāthā*. London: The Pali Text Society. Reprint 1995.
- . 1971. *The Elders' Verses II: Therīgāthā*. London: The Pali Text Society. Reprint 1995.
- . 2001. *The Group of Discourses (Sutta-Nipāta)*. Second Edition. Translated with Introduction and Notes. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Ohira, Suzuko. 1994. *A Study of the Bhagavatī-sūtra: A Chronological Analysis*. Prakrit Text Series No. 28. Ahmedabad: Prakrit Text Society.

- Olivelle, Patrick. 2013. *King, Governance, and Law in Ancient India: Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra: A New Annotated Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pischel, Richard. 1900. *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner. Reprint: Tokyo: Meicho-Fukyū-Kai, 1977.
- Punyavijaya (Muni), and Pt. Amritlāl Mohanlāl Bhojak. 1977. *Dasaveyāliysuttaṃ, Uttarajhayaṇāṃ, and Āvassayasuttaṃ*. Jaina-Āgama-Series No.15. Bombay: Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya.
- Ratnachandra (Muni). 1923–1932. *An Illustrated Ardha-Māgadhi Dictionary*. 4 vols. Reprint: Tokyo: Meicho-Fukyū-Kai, 1977.
- Raychaudhuri, Hemchandra. 1996. *Political History of Ancient India: From the Accession of Parikshit to the Extinction of the Gupta Dynasty*. Revised edition with a commentary by B. N. Mukherjee. Delhi: Oxford University Press (First edition published in 1923).
- Śāha, Subodhacandra Nānālāla. 1977. *Triṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacaritam Mahākāvyaṃ. Daśamaṃ Parva*. Muṃbaī: Śrīmatī Gaṃgābāi Jaina Cerīṭebala Traṣṭa.
- Schmithausen, Lambert. 1992. “An Attempt to Estimate the Distance in Time between Aśoka and the Buddha in Terms of Doctrinal History.” In *The Dating of the Historical Buddha / Die Datierung des historischen Buddha*, Part 2, edited by Heinz Bechert, 110–147. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1999. “Aspects of the Buddhist Attitude towards War” In *Violence Denied: Violence, Non-Violence and the Rationalization of Violence in South Asian Cultural History*, edited by Jan E. M. Houben and Karel R. van Kooij, 45–67. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2014. “Early Buddhism and Peace.” In *Okuda Shouou Sensei Shōju Kinen Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Ronshū* 奥田聖應先生頌寿記念インド学仏教学論集 = *Indian and Buddhist Studies in Honor of President Dr. Shouou (Kiyooki) Okuda in Recognition of His Lifelong Scholarship*, 34–50. Tokyo: Kōsei Shuppansha 佼成出版社.
- Schubring, Walter. 1935. *Die Lehre der Jainas nach den alten Quellen dargestellt*. Berlin und Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Shimoda, Masahiro 下田正弘. 2002. “Shoki bukyō ni okeru bōryoku no mondai: Shumittōhauzen kyōju no rikai ni tsuite” 初期仏教における暴力の問題—シュミットハウゼン教授の理解について. In *Higashijia bukyō: sono seiritsu to tenkai* 東アジア仏教—その成立と展開 = *Kimura Kiyotaka hakushi kanreki kinen ronshū* 木村清孝博士還暦記念論集, 389–404. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- Upadhyaya, Kash Nath. 1971. *Early Buddhism and the Bhagavadgītā*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1944–1948. *Die Überlieferung vom Lebensende des Buddha: Eine vergleichende Analyse des Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra und seiner Textentsprechungen*. 2 Teile. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wiles, Royce. 2000. *The Nirayāvaliyāsuyakkhandha and Its Commentary by Śrīcandra: Critical Edition, Translation and Notes*. Ph.D. diss., Australian National University.
- Williams, Robert. 1967. *Jaina Yoga: A Survey of the Medieval Śrāvakācāras*. London Oriental Series, vol. 14. London: Oxford University Press.
- Woodward, F. L. 1927. *The Book of the Kindred Sayings (Saṃyutta-Nikāya) or Grouped Suttas*. Part IV. London: The Pali Text Society.
- Zimmermann, Michael. 2000. “A Mahāyānist Criticism of Arthaśāstra: The Chapter on Royal Ethics in the *Bodhisattva-gocaropāya-viśaya-vikurvaṇa-nirdeśa-sūtra*.” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 3: 177–211.
- . 2004. “War.” In *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, edited by Robert E. Buswell, Jr., 893–897. New York: Macmillan Reference USA.